

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 11-12, 14-17 and 19-20.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action.

With regard to the minor objections on page 2 of the Official Action, all of the Examiner's suggestions (1)-(3) have been adopted.

Turning to the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph:

(A) The parenthetical expressions have been deleted since the material within the parenthesis is intended to be included in claims 11, 15 and 16.

(B) There is no indefiniteness in defining the location of the bond between Hex and HexNAc since linkages to all positions are intended to be included.

(C) Terms such as "may be" or "may have" have been deleted and have been replaced by "optionally". Both terms are intended to have the same meaning.

(D) The term "a hydrocarbon chain, a sugar chain, a lipid, a protein and a synthetic polymer has been changed to "a hydrogen atom, a hydrocarbon chain, a sugar chain, a lipid and a synthetic polymer. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand the meaning of these conventional terms. All materials failing within the scope of such terms is intended to be within the scope of the claims.

One of ordinary skill in the art would also be able to tell with certainty whether he is infringing the claim and this is the test for definiteness.

(E) The term "natural" has been deleted.

(F) The term "Se-glycoside linkage" refers to a selenium-glycoside linkage.

(G) The term "chemically converted linkage" has been deleted.

Claims 11 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Strecker et al. (Eur. J. Biochem. 75, pp. 391-403, 1977).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 11 in which "Hex-R" is changed to "Gal-R" is not disclosed by Strecker et al.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 11 and 20 as anticipated by Strecker et al. is untenable.

Claims 12-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (Prog. Lipid Res., Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 429-457, 1994) in view of Masuda et al. (FEBS Letters, 464, pp. 71-74, 1999).

This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Regarding the 103(a) rejection, it should be noted that Suzuki and Masuda et al. were based on work by the present inventor, Yasuo Suzuki and do not suggest the specific branched structure of the present invention and superior effect thereof. See pages 2 and 3 of the present specification in this regard.

For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that the rejections of prior art are untenable and should be withdrawn.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Yasuo SUZUKI et al.

By: Matthew M. Jacob
Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/dlk
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 6, 2006